UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.     | FILING DATE                   | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/579,445          | 10/04/2006                    | Christer Nordstedt   | GRT/117-580         | 6580             |
|                     | 7590 10/10/200<br>NDERHYE, PC | EXAMINER             |                     |                  |
| 901 NORTH G         | LEBE ROAD, 11TH F             | GUSSOW, ANNE         |                     |                  |
| ARLINGTON, VA 22203 |                               | •                    | ART UNIT            | PAPER NUMBER     |
|                     |                               |                      | 1643                |                  |
|                     | •                             |                      |                     |                  |
|                     |                               |                      | MAIL DATE           | DELIVERY MODE    |
|                     |                               |                      | 10/10/2007          | PAPER            |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| ,   | Application No.  | Applicant(s)  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
|   | 10/579,445   | NORDSTEDT ET AL.  |  |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary   | Examiner   | Art Unit  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Anne M. Gussow   | 1643  |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication a<br>Period for Reply  | ppears on the cover sheet with   | n the correspondence address  |  |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stat Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the main earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION OF THIS COMMUNICA | ATION.  Note that the state of this communication.  NDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). |  |  |  |  |
| Status  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
|   | , <del>-</del>   |   |  |  |  |  |
|   | closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 4) Claim(s) 1-9,11,20,21,28-33,37-55 and 59-6   | 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9,11,20,21,28-33,37-55 and 59-69</u> is/are pending in the application.  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 6) ☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected.  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 8) Claim(s) <u>1-9,11,20,21,28-33,37-55 and 59-6</u>  | 8) Claim(s) 1-9,11,20,21,28-33,37-55 and 59-69 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.   |   |  |  |  |  |
| Application Papers  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a  | ccepted or b) objected to by   | y the Examiner.   |  |  |  |  |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the   | Examiner. Note the attached  | Office Action or form PTO-152.  |  |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.  |  |   |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   |  | mmary (PTO-413)   |  |  |  |  |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  |  | Mail Date<br>ormal Patent Application   |  |  |  |  |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date   | 6) Other:  | ar a second representation  |  |  |  |  |

Application/Control Number: 10/579,445 Page 2

Art Unit: 1643

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Election/Restrictions

- 1. The previous Restriction Requirement has been vacated.
- 2. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I claim(s) 1-9, 20, 21, 28-33, 37-55, 59, 60 and 68 drawn to a human antibody or antibody fragment and a method of treating an amyloid disorder.

Group II, claim(s) 61-63, drawn to a method of diagnosing an amyloid disorder.

Group III, claim(s) 64-66, drawn to a polynucleotide, vector and host cell.

Group IV, claim(s) 67, drawn to a virus.

Group V, claim(s) 69, drawn to a method of detecting ApoE-CTD.

3. The inventions listed as Groups I-V do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

A national stage application shall relate to one invention only or to a group of inventions so linked as to form a single general inventive concept. When claims to different categories are present in the application, the claims will be considered to have

Page 3

Art Unit: 1643

unity of invention if the claims are drawn only to one of the following combinations of categories: (1) A product and a process specially adapted for the manufacture of said product; or (2) A product and a process of use of said product; or (3) A product, a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and a use of the said product; or (4) A process and an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out the said process; or (5) A product, a process specially adapted for the manufacture of the said product, and an apparatus or means specifically designed for carrying out the said process. If multiple products, processes of manufacture or uses are claimed, the first invention of the category first mentioned in the claims of the application will be considered as the main invention in the claims, see PCT article 17(3) (a) and 1.476 (c), 37 C.F.R. 1.475(b) and (d). Group I will be the main invention. After that, all other products and methods will be broken out as separate groups (see 37 CFR 1.475(d).)

Group I is drawn to an antibody and a method of using the antibody. All of the other groups are drawn to additional products and methods that do not comprise combinations of Group I. Therefore restriction is proper.

The technical feature of Group I is an antibody which is not required for Groups III and IV. The technical feature of Group III is a polynucleotide which is not required for Groups I-II, or V. The technical feature of Group IV is a virus which is not required for Groups I-III or V.

4. This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species. If any of the groups are elected, then applicant is required to elect a single

Application/Control Number: 10/579,445

Art Unit: 1643

antibody species for examination including the sequence of either the heavy chain and the light chain or the sequences of the 3 heavy chain CDRs and 3 light chain CDRs.

The species are independent or distinct because they are different sequence structures and claims to the different species recite the mutually exclusive characteristics of such species. In addition, these species are not obvious variants of each other based on the current record.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, no claim is generic.

There is an examination and search burden for these patentably distinct species due to their mutually exclusive characteristics. The species require a different field of search (e.g., searching different classes/subclasses or electronic resources, or employing different search queries); and/or the prior art applicable to one species would not likely be applicable to another species; and/or the species are likely to raise different non-prior art issues under 35 U.S.C. 101 and/or 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete <u>must</u> include (i) an election of a species to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

The election of the species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the election of species requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected species.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the species unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other species.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141.

5. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

- 6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).
- 7. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

  Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

Application/Control Number: 10/579,445

Art Unit: 1643

All claims directed a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

Page 7

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anne M. Gussow whose telephone number is (571) 272-6047. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30 am - 5 pm.

Application/Control Number: 10/579,445 Page 8

Art Unit: 1643

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Larry Helms can be reached on (571) 272-0832. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Anne M. Gussow

October 5, 2007

LARRY R. HELMS, PH.D. SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER